R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 003 950 48

CONFERENCE ON NEGLECTED LANGUAGES.

BY- FIFE, AUSTIN E. NIELSEN, MARION L.
MODERN LANGUAGE ASSN. OF AMERICA, NEW YORK, N.Y.

REPORT NUMBER NDEA-VI-1-11 PUB DATE NOV 61
CONTRACT OEC-SAE-8342
EDRS PRICE MF-$0.09 HC-$0.80 20P. REPRINT FROM REPORTS OF SURVEYS AND STUDIES IN THE TEACHING OF MODERN FOREIGN LANGUAGE, NOV. 1961.

DESCRIPTORS- PROGRAM EVALUATION, *MODERN LANGUAGES, *CONFERENCES, *LANGUAGE PROGRAMS, PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT, *COMMUNICATION PROBLEMS, EDUCATIONAL NEEDS, CAREER OPPORTUNITIES, *LINGUISTIC PATTERNS, NEW YORK CITY, NEW YORK

A CONFERENCE WAS HELD TO MAKE RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE STUDY OF LANGUAGES OTHER THAN ENGLISH, FRENCH, GERMAN, ITALIAN, RUSSIAN, AND SPANISH. DISCUSSIONS WERE CENTERED ON (1) DETERMINING CRITERIA FOR THE SELECTION OF NEGLECTED LANGUAGES WORTHY OF INCREASED STUDY, (2) SELECTING A LIST OF LANGUAGES MEETING THE CRITERIA, (3) A STATEMENT FOR EACH LANGUAGE OF THE TOOLS AND BASIC RESEARCH NEEDED, AND (4) A STATEMENT OF THE MAGNITUDE OF PROGRAMS AND MANPOWER TO BE ALLOCATED TO THE LANGUAGES. TWENTY-EIGHT SPECIALISTS IN THE FIELD OF MODERN LANGUAGES DEVELOPED AND AGREED UPON 13 RECOMMENDATIONS WHICH DEALT WITH (1) THE MAJOR LANGUAGES OF THE WORLD, (2) PRIORITIES IN TEACHING MATERIALSS, (3) BILINGUAL DICTIONARIES, (4) DESCRIPTIVE ANALYSES OF PERTINENT LANGUAGES, (5) LINGUISTIC RESEARCH, (6) COORDINATING THE PREPARATION AND DISSEMINATION OF MATERIALS, (7) TEACHER EDUCATION, (8) GRADUATE SCHOOL RESPONSIBILITY, (9) ENTRANCE AND DEGREE REQUIREMENTS, (10) ESTABLISHMENT OF ENDOWED CHAIRS FOR NEGLECTED LANGUAGES, (11) A STUDY OF AN INSTITUTE FOR FAR EASTERN LANGUAGES, (12) ESTABLISHMENT OF LANGUAGE CENTERS ABROAD, AND (13) RESOLUTIONS ON FURTHER ACTIVITY IN MEETING COMMUNICATIONS NEEDS. REPORTS IN THIS SERIES ARE ED 003 940 THROUGH ED 003 960. (RS)

1-11
SAE 8342

PRECEDING PAGE MISSING

THE MODERN LANGUAGE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE
Office of Education
This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions stated do not necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

Conference on Neglected Languages.
A Report

AUSTIN E. FIFE AND MARION L. NIELSEN

ED003950

Reprinted from
REPORTS OF SURVEYS AND STUDIES
IN THE TEACHING OF MODERN FOREIGN LANGUAGES
PUBLISHED BY THE MODERN LANGUAGE ASSOCIATION
NOVEMBER 1961

The research reported herein was performed persuant to a contract with the United States Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Conference on Neglected Languages*

REPORT BY AUSTIN E. FIFE AND MARION L. NIELSEN

Background: The Conference on Neglected[1] Languages, which met at the Brookings Institution in Washington, D.C., on 27 and 28 March 1961, was held under the auspices of the Modern Language Association of America and the United States Office of Education. The purpose was to bring into a unified whole the deliberations and conclusions of a number of conferences previously convoked to deal with specific problems of language development. A further purpose was to make recommendations concerning development of the study of the neglected languages which might be helpful in future planning to government and military agencies, institutions of higher learning, foundations, and other organizations.

The obligation of the conference, as defined by the Modern Language Association and the U. S. Office of Education, was as follows: (1) The formulation of a statement concerning criteria for the selection of languages deemed worthy of increased study in the national interest or for increased study under other stated conditions. (2) The formulation of a list of neglected languages deemed worthy of special consideration in accordance with the criteria of (1) above. (This was by specific definition to constitute a revision, refinement, and extension of the United States Office of Education's lists of highest priority languages encompassing the view of the total national effort, and not merely that of the National Defense Education Act.) (3) The formulation of a separate statement for each of these languages concerning the scope and variety of tools of basic access which must be created, and of other essential basic research which must be performed; and (4) The formulation of a statement concerning the magnitude of programs and manpower to be allocated to languages of stated priority levels for the satisfaction of minimum and optimum national needs.

Conference Proceedings: In a discussion of the underlying considerations of the conference,[2] and of the national need for development in the neglected languages, several conferees stressed the importance of looking to the long-term needs of the United States in this area. While admitting the importance of meeting the immediate and practical needs—the strategic needs—they made a plea for recognition by the government and by foundations of the fact that sound development in the nation's foreign language programs can come only from long-term programs securely financed and under conditions which assure for those involved a permanent and professional commitment.

Reference was made to the wording of the National Defense Education Act wherein the U. S. Commissioner of Education is authorized to contract for *Centers* for the teaching of languages which are needed by government, business, industry, or education, but which are inadequately offered in American institutions of higher education. The word "inadequate" has been interpreted not only in terms of quantity but also of quality. Starting from this basic interpretation of the law, it is possible to put into the list of "needed" languages any national language of the world, and to proceed from there to a list of languages which are spoken by large numbers of people, whether national or not. Trained persons in all such languages will obviously be needed by the country, whatever conditions may prevail.

Although English, French, German, Italian, Russian, and Spanish were left out of consideration for the purposes of this conference, and all of these except Russian in the establishment of *Centers*, it was pointed out that these commonly taught languages too are "neglected," especially in terms of quality of training. The participants stressed the continuing importance of improved and increased study of these common languages.

In discussing the development of the neglected languages, the conference agreed that career opportunities are very closely bound up with the whole problem. Chinese was used as an example. No one would dispute the over-riding importance of Chinese. Today we may not need more than a few hundred people trained in Chinese. Four years from now we may need several thousand. But are we prepared to train a large corps of young people in Chinese and have them come out of the colleges with assurance of a career? We may buy students for these programs in great numbers, but are we willing also to assure career opportunities?

The obligation of the colleges to provide some of these career opportunities was stressed. They now provide the chief place where continuing career opportunities in the neglected languages are available, though in relatively small numbers. But it should not be forgotten that even these opportunities are generated by outside funds, largely from the government or the foundations.

Reference was made also to the transitory nature of language skills, and it was pointed out that continuing ability to provide skills in these languages must be lodged either in the colleges and universities, or in some kind of institute such as Germany had in World War II, or Russia has today.

Presentation was made to the conference of the survey sheet on priorities which had been previously sent out to specialists in neglected languages. Discussion of the fifteen criteria listed thereon resulted in the request that a sixteenth be added (political significance) and that the list, accompanied by an explanatory statement, be made a matter of record by the conference.[3] The consensus

[1] For purposes of the Conference the term "neglected" was understood to include all major languages of the world except English, French, German, Italian, Russian, and Spanish.

[2] Based upon a work paper prepared by Austin E. Fife and Marion L. Nielsen which details the position of the United States in world leadership and the hampering factors it meets with in its monolingualism.

* The following participated in the conference: Rolfe L. Allen, Department of the Army; Charles E. Bidwell, University of Pittsburgh; Donald N. Bigelow, Inventory of Language and Area Centers, American Council on Education; W. Norman Brown, University of Pennsylvania (in absentia); William Curran, National Security Agency; Henry C. Fenn, Institute of Far Eastern Languages, Yale University; Charles A. Ferguson, Center for Applied Linguistics; Austin E. Fife, Utah State University; Melvin J. Fox, Ford Foundation; A. Bruce Gaarder, Language Development Section, Financial Aid Branch, Division of Higher Education, U. S. Office of Education; Harold A. Goldklang, Central Intelligence Agency; Mortimer Graves, American Council of Learned Societies (Retired); Einar Haugen, University of Wisconsin; Richard H. Heindel, Wagner College (in absentia); Earl R. Hewitt, Society of Federal Linguists; Carleton T. Hodge, Foreign Service Institute; William C. Johnstone, Johns Hopkins University; John Lotz, Columbia University; Norman A. McQuown, University of Chicago; Kenneth W. Mildenberger, Language Development Section, Financial Aid Branch, Division of Higher Education, U. S. Office of Education; Eugene A. Nida, American Bible Society (in absentia); Marion L. Nielsen, Utah State University; Earl W. Stevick, Foreign Service Institute; Robert P. Stockwell, University of California at Los Angeles; Donald D. Walsh, Modern Language Association of America; William E. Welmers, University of California at Los Angeles (in absentia); Edward D. Wolski, Society of Federal Linguists; Joseph K. Yamagiwa, University of Michigan (in absentia).

[3] (1) Enhancement of international understanding and cooperation; (2) enhancement of prestige abroad; (3) cultural significance; (4) cultural and/or ethnic affinity; (5) advancement of linguistic science; (6) number of speakers; (7) representation of a political entity; (8) geographic location; (9) fulfillment of U.S. obligations under treaties and alliances; (10) international commerce and trade; (11) exchange of scientific and technological information; (12) residence of U.S. nationals abroad; (13) philanthropic and religious operations; (14) residence of foreign nationals in the U.S.; (15) need of target language as a vehicle for teaching English; (16) political significance.

of the conference, after deliberation on the sixteen points of criteria, was that in our national interest we should recognize as of *first priority* for development all languages of a national political unit; of *second importance*, all languages other than national languages of major regional and cultural significance; and of *third importance*, languages of lesser regional and cultural significance.

Discussion of the work paper on the languages of sub-Saharan Africa[4] led to the strong endorsement of the "group approach" in view of the fact that this area presents particular problems, not only because of the lack of teaching materials and scarcity of trained linguists, but also because of difficulties in obtaining informants and, especially, because of uncertainty concerning the future development of these languages due to the extremely fluid political situation of the area. It has been pointed out that a similar approach has been utilized and followed in other areas in the past, such as in Scandinavia, Central Asia, and the Philippines.

A committee was appointed to produce a list of neglected languages based on the criteria stated above. In submitting the list the conference emphasized the following principles: (1) The languages would have to be evaluated further from the point of view of significance in terms of the NDEA. The number of speakers should be taken into account, and numbers such as 20 or 65 million have been suggested as a cut-off point for a highest priority list. (2) The conference endorsed the selection of the present highest priority list of six languages of the NDEA. (3) The conference recommended the periodic revision of the list, by adding languages to the highest priority list if this is deemed to be in the national interest, and that if at some time in the future it should appear that sufficient people have been trained and adequate materials have been prepared for a given language it might then be reduced to a lesser order of importance.

The members of the conference unanimously accepted the recommendations of the committee with respect to the language list and accompanying statements (Recommendation No. 1). Perhaps for the first time in planning a practical program the value of *comparative* linguistics was recognized.

Discussing briefly the inventory of language learning tools, the conference agreed that the conference directors, on the basis of the inventory forms sent out (appended herewith) and other available data, should prepare a statement on the obvious areas of "needed and not available."[5]

In connection with the work paper "Tools for the Acquisition of a Second Language,"[6] it was pointed out that there is need for materials for extra-professional or "short course" purposes, where the goal is not to train professional linguists but rather to give experts in various fields minimum language skills for more effective contacts in countries to which they are assigned. Considerable work is being done in this area at the Foreign Service Institute and the Army Language School. It was felt that materials of this kind can and should be developed on a linguistically sound basis. Mention was made of the desirability of investigating machine-programmed courses in this connection.

The point was made that in planning teaching materials, the kinds of tools available in the target language itself are too often over-looked. With special reference to reading, for example, too little use is made of newspapers and periodicals in the target languages and of dictionaries and other reference works written entirely in the target language. In this connection the so-called Dingell Amendment to Public Law 480, passed in 1958, was discussed. This Amendment would authorize the Librarian of Congress to use funds derived from the sale of surplus agricultural products abroad for the purchase and complete servicing of foreign language books, periodicals, and related materials. This activity would be subject, however, to annual appropriations by Congress and no such funds have as yet been approved. Under Public Law 480 it is also possible for grants to be made to American institutions for activities overseas. This could have very broad implications for the establishment of Centers abroad, for grants in aid for language and area studies abroad, and for linguistic research.

Discussion of specific tools of access which ought to be made available for languages of a given level of priority led to Recommendation No. 2.

The problem of lexical resources was explored, with reference to the recent Conference on Lexicography at Indiana University. Specifically, the critical national need for bi-lingual dictionaries was discussed. The point was made that the preparation of an adequate bi-lingual dictionary is a long-term project and an expensive one; moreover, that a dictionary requires continuous reworking. The conference agreed upon the need for a national commission on lexicography with a permanent staff. It would be necessary for such a commission to operate at a very high and costly level until the instruments were created, and then to operate indefinitely at a maintenance level. It was pointed out that for maximum usefulness these instruments should be created for American English, but the point was made that where good dictionaries exist for British English usage, and where resources are limited, such dictionaries should not be considered an insurmountable barrier for American students. Some members of the conference urged that ideally in the preparation of a bi-lingual dictionary more attention should be given to adequate information concerning the grammatical usage of items in the lexicon (see Recommendation No. 3). Attention was called to the fact that cooperation with linguists in European countries would be of great aid to us in producing materials to provide access to neglected languages.

It was observed that possibly materials produced by public moneys should be available to all who might wish to use them. In this connection, attention was invited to some of the activities of the Center for Applied Linguistics of the Modern Language Association of America. It is developing a file, books, and teaching materials prepared by government agencies and elsewhere which are not otherwise normally accessible for the academic community. It has a publication section responsible for getting ready for publication, and in some cases actually publishing, such materials.

Discussion of the problem of coordination of the activities of government agencies, universities, and foundations occurred briefly, although no formal recommendation was made.

Presentation of the work paper "Research and Training in Linguistics and the National Interest"[7] led to essential agreement of the conferees on the importance of supporting basic descriptive analyses of the neglected languages as an essential first step in the prepartion of effective teaching materials. There was emphasis on producing more linguists, and on getting more basic research done, irrespective of immediate practical application. In further discussion it was agreed that two resolutions be formulated, one on the need for basic research in linguistics and another on grammar, worded in such a way as to parallel the resolution on lexicons. (See Recommendations 4 and 5.)

Discussion of the work paper "Training in Neglected Languages: Who and For What?"[8] stressed the importance of trying in some way to satisfy

[4] By William E. Welmers, "African Language Programs: Problems and Proposals."

[5] The report was prepared in four copies, two for the files of the Modern Language Association and two for the U.S. Office of Education.

[6] By Austin E. Fife.

[7] By Norman A. McQuown.

[8] By William Crane Johnstone.

the immediate language needs of non-linguists being sent abroad by such agencies as ICA—people who are not being helped by programs in lexicography or linguistic research projected five or ten years in the future. Strong support was given to the idea of reaching undergraduates with training in the neglected languages, which will better equip them for future foreign assignments. In further discussion of the plight of the many Americans without any language competence who go abroad, it was suggested that brief pamphlet-like regional or country handbooks be prepared, with some vocabulary in the language in question, statements on useful grammatical rules in the language, and advice concerning salient features of the culture. Recommendation No. 6 was adopted. Further discussion of this problem as it relates to the recommendation concerning establishment of Centers abroad (Recommendation No. 12), is reported below.

The problem of adequate training of teachers of foreign languages received the attention of the conference, and resulted in Recommendation No. 7.

Discussion of pre-collegiate and under-graduate programs was based on the work paper on this subject presented by Joseph K. Yamagiwa. Sentiment developed in favor of the support of undergraduate and even high school programs in the major neglected languages in cases where sound programs with adequate continuity can be established. Encouragement should be given to such programs, particularly in localities or areas where ethnic groups make them more meaningful and hence give greater assurance of success. (See Recommendation No. 8.) The observation was also made that too often the graduate student has been inadequately trained in English for the work expected of him, and that this area should be strengthened.

In a discussion of foreign language requirements, both for the under-graduate degree and for the Ph.D., considerable support became apparent for acceptance of work in the neglected languages, particularly the major neglected languages, to satisfy these requirements, or a portion of these requirements, particularly when the language studied is especially appropriate to the candidate's major or minor field of specialization. It was felt that major neglected languages ought to be accepted as satisfying under-graduate language requirements. See Recommendation No. 9.

Discussion of incentives both for students to study the neglected languages, and for professional training in them, was a matter of continued concern throughout the conference. The problem of supplying our country with a reserve to meet future national needs in any of the languages, while assuring the individual security in his chosen field of endeavor, received attention. The suggestion of a manpower reserve in languages, with a national register of competency and financial rewards, was very briefly discussed. Features of the proposal of Centers located abroad described in the work paper by Robert P. Stockwell and Clifford H. Prator, in Recommendation No. 12, and below seemed to present some solutions to this problem. The establishment of endowed chairs in languages is, of course, an optimum way of meeting this difficulty, and the conference recognized and encouraged programs in support thereof in Recommendation No. 10.

The work paper "Training for Foreign Language Competence"* and the discussion of training programs at the Institute for Far Eastern Studies at Yale University pointed up advantages of intensive summer or full-year courses to enable the student to have real and useful competence in a language by the time he enters upon the upper-class and graduate years, so that he can use the language as a research tool in a meaningful way. Consideration was given to more support for the type of language training in various institutions which will make it possible for the student to devote summers to intensive work in the spoken and written languages, or to devote a full year to intensive language training prior to the conclusion of graduate studies. The need for—and the desire of students to acquire—skill in a chosen language at a period earlier than the beginning of graduate studies was emphasized, and its implementation deemed necessary in order to meet national needs in the neglected languages. Expansion of programs to meet this kind of need was recommended (Recommendation No. 11). It was also recommended that cooperative university programs, especially for summer institutes, should be encouraged to fill the needs of graduate schools which do not have the facilities to meet the needs of their own students.

At several points during the conference discussions reference was made to the potential afforded by institutions such as the UCLA Center in the Philippines for a coordinated assault on several of the problems of concern to the conference, including (1) the development of language learning materials; (2) coordination of language and area studies, including the social sciences; (3) training of Americans who are to carry out various scholarly, governmental, or other missions in the host country; (4) coordination of linguistic, anthropological, and other research concerning the language and culture of the area; (5) study of non-national languages of the area according to the group concept previously discussed; (6) field training for language and/or area specialists; (7) training of linguists from the host country; (8) program continuity in that the professional staff of these Centers would hold faculty rank in the parent universities. (See Recommendation No. 12.) Financial support for such Centers under Public Law 480 was discussed.

The conference returned to the subject of permanency for neglected language programs. The real need for public support for long-term programs was stressed. If it is in the public interest to maintain a reservoir of persons trained in non-salable languages against some future need, then it certainly is up to the public to pay for it through their agency, the Federal government. An analogy was made to the government's paying out millions of dollars to people to maintain their competency as reserve officers. Why could not Congress authorize stipends to those who are willing to acquire and maintain competence in a neglected language? Attention was called to the important role which the foundations can play in this regard, and to the role they have already played.

The conference noted the following resolutions of the first annual conference of State Supervisors of Foreign Language Instruction held in Washington, D.C., in the summer of 1960: (1) that a thorough survey be made of available teachers of major neglected languages in each state; (2) that a careful search be made for persons who can become teachers of major neglected languages; (3) that colleges, universities, and teacher training institutions make broader provision for professional preparation in the major neglected languages; (4) that major neglected languages should not be started unless the school is prepared to offer an adequate sequential program; (5) that each state should stimulate interest in major neglected languages; (6) that reaffirmation be made that the intent of the NDEA to strengthen instruction in modern foreign languages is not merely restricted to the commonly taught languages; (7) that professional foreign language people be urged to prepare themselves in critical foreign languages.

Agreement was expressed therewith, but a note of caution was added with respect to number 7, to the effect that this preparation in a neglected language be undertaken, not with the view of becoming a teacher thereof, but as an exercise in linguistic sophistication to enhance his skill as a teacher of the language in which he already has competence.

The statement, prepared by Eugene A. Nida,

*By Eugene A. Nida.

conference participant *in absentia,* did not come up for discussion in detail by the conference, but cognizance was taken of its importance.

In summarizing and closing the conference, the chairman referred to a number of important considerations in the development of the neglected languages which he felt needed further study and deliberation. He offered a recommendation dealing with these problems, which was approved by the conference. (See Recommendation No. 13.)

Recommendation No. 1. The major languages of the world: The conference decided to establish a list which is partly generic and partly areal in three columns: (1) national languages; (2) languages other than national languages of major regional and cultural significance; and (3) other languages to be considered. Sequence on the list is as follows: Indo-European; Dravidian; Afro-Asiatic; African; other East and Southeast Asian languages; Uralic-Altaic, Amerindian; others. Of these groupings, the Indo-European and Afro-Asiatic are linguistic families, Uralic-Altaic is a grouping of two families. English, French, German, Italian, Spanish, and Russian, though not considered "neglected," are listed in parentheses for the sake of completeness.

It further agreed to arrange the languages in a parallel grouping across the three columns to indicate, in *grosso modo,* the generic relationships between the languages of each column. This arrangement was made following a consensus among participants that, for some programming purposes, it would be more reasonable to operate on an area or generic basis: i.e., emphasizing a language of column 1, but encompassing also parallel languages in columns 2 and 3. This group approach was strongly endorsed by conference specialists representing sub-Saharan Africa, Middle Europe, Southeast Asia, the Scandinavian languages, and those of Central Asia.

It faced the fact that it would be impossible to identify which of the sub-Saharan languages are or may become "national." The conference decided, therefore, to accept the recommendations of Mr. Welmers' work paper as its recommendation, namely that priorities should be assigned not to individual languages, but to *groups* of related languages. The highest priority assigned to the group could be claimed by a program for any language or languages of the group. On the list, within each group, the most likely "starting point" language(s) has/have been listed in column 2, the remainder in column 3.

Recommendation No. 2. Priorities in teaching materials: The conference goes on record supporting the creation of instructional and other tools of access to a foreign language in the following order of importance:

1. Highest priority:

a. A basic linguistic analysis so constructed as to be usable also as a reference grammar for an advanced learner. (Items B1 and B2 of the appended materials list.) Where pertinent, this analysis would encompass the writing system as well as the spoken language. (Item B4 of the materials list.)

b. Bi-lingual lexical resources, especially a comprehensive dictionary target language/English, and English/target language. (Items B6 to B10 of the materials list.)

c. A basic and/or basic intensive course, (items A1, A2 and A3 of the materials list), including all audio-visual materials which are essential to make these basic course materials meaningful to the learner.

2. Second highest priority:

a. All learning tools beyond the basic level essential to help the learner achieve competence in the aural and visual use of the target language or to make the transition from the use of learner's materials to the direct use of sources in the target language. (Items A5 to A10 of the materials list.)

b. An annotated bibliographical guide to studies of the language and area. (Item B3 of the materials list.)

3. Third highest priority:

All other learning or research tools not listed in categories one and two above which specialists in the language feel are necessary, including such items as expanded literary and bibliographical resources, tests, or other instruments to certify competence in the use of the language, and sundry specialized studies.

See the appended inventory form used for discovering the present status of these teaching materials.

Recommendation No. 3. Bi-lingual dictionaries: The conference views the lack of adequate bi-lingual dictionaries (from English into the world's national languages, and from these languages into English), as a grave barrier to bilingualism and international understanding. It is therefore recommended that steps be taken to establish a national lexicographical center, on a permanent basis, with extensively cooperating university sub-centers for particular languages or areas, supported by government and/or foundation funds, and designed to accomplish the following objectives: (1) To prepare, or cause to be prepared, dictionaries of all languages for which the need exists, dictionaries conceived as tools of access into the language for the American learner, as general reference tools for linguists, translators, foreign service personnel, travelers, and the like, and as a key move in the effort to achieve increased international understanding. (2) Conceived as tools of access, the dictionaries should include such detailed grammatical information as will give the learner proper guidance in using new words in the formation of grammatical sentences. (3) Conceived as general reference tools, the dictionaries should be comprehensive, including extensive citations of the usage and variety of meaning of every entry. (4) Conceived as basic to international understanding, the dictionaries should include counterpart volumes constructed from the point of view of the speakers of the target language who wish to use the lexicon as a tool of access to English. (5) Because it is in the very nature of language to change through time, and because refinements of human knowledge continually demand the revision and improvement of first productions, the establishment of a national lexicographical center should include full provision for permanence to allow for maintenance of the dictionaries and continuous updating thereof. (6) Cooperation with the nations where the target language is spoken should be secured, including full participation by their scholars in the lexicographical work.

Recommendation No. 4. Descriptive analyses: The conference recommends that large scale projects be organized on the analysis and description of all languages pertinent to the national language program. The principles guiding the analysis and description of the languages should represent the best thinking of contemporary linguistic scholarship and the projects should provide adequate resources for carrying out the program both as to manpower for the compilation of the basic data and as to the amount of time needed.

Due to changes in language and the development of improved analytic techniques, provision should be made for a continuing and adequate revision of the materials collected and presented. Reports should be issued and conferences organized for discussion of general and particular aspects of problems growing out of the work. The phonological aspect of the work should use the best instrumental and experimental techniques, and the work on grammar should be carried out in close coordination with corresponding lexicographical work.

Recommendation No. 5. Linguistic research: The conference recognizes that continuing basic linguistic research of a non-restricted nature is essential to the optimum development of linguistics, and the application thereof to strategic language programs. It further recognizes that the funding of such research by government, foundations, and universities is in the national interest as an essential component of neglected language development.

In view of the fact that English imposes interfering patterns on the target language that the speaker of English is to learn, this conference urges the government, foundations, and the aca-

1 National languages	2 Languages of major regional or cultural significance	3 Other languages to be considered
(English)	Sierra Leone Creole	
(German)		
Dutch		
Afrikaans		
Swedish		
Danish		
Norwegian		
Icelandic		
Albanian		
Greek		
(Russian)	Ukrainian	
	Bielorussian	
Czech	Slovak	
Polish	Slovenian	
Serbocroatian	Macedonian	
Bulgarian		
(French)		Creole (Haitian)
(Italian)		
(Spanish)		Catalan
Portuguese		
Rumanian		
	Lithuanian[10]	
	Lettish[10]	
	Armenian	
Persian	Tajik	
	Kurdish	
Pashto		
Hindi/Urdu	Gujerati	Kashmiri
Nepali	Marathi	Rajasthani
Singhalese	Punjabi	
Bengali	Sindhi	
	Bihari	
	Tamil	
	Kannada	
	Malayalam	
	Telugu	
Amharic		Tigrinya
Arabic		
Contemporary[11]		
Egyptian		
Syrian		
Iraqi		
Maghrebi		
Saudi		
Sudanese		
Hebrew		
Somali		Galla
		Sidamo
	Shilha	Rif
		Kabyle

[10] Although the United States does not recognize the absorption of Latvia and Lithuania by the U.S.S.R., the Conference has listed Lithuanian and Lettish, as has the 1961 *Britannica Yearbook*, under the U.S.S.R. rather than as a national language.

[11] Term adopted by the International Conference on the Teaching of Arabic to non-Arabs, Madrid, September 1959. It refers to modern written Arabic used in all Arab-speaking countries.

1 National languages	2 Languages of major regional or cultural significance	3 Other languages to be considered
	Hausa	
	Fula	Wolof
		Themne
	Bambara-Maninka	Kpelle
		Mende
	Moré	Senari-Suppire
		Kru-Bassa
	Akan	Anyi-Baule
		Ewe-Fon
	Yoruba	Bini
	Ibo	Efik-Ibibio, Tiv
	Sango-Ngbandi	Zande
		Kanuri
	KiKongo	Fang-Bulu
	LiNgala	LoMongo-LoNkundo
		UMbundu
		KiMbundu
		CiCokwe
	ChiLuba	KinyaRuanda
		KiRundi
		IciBemba
	IsiZulu	IsiXhosa
		SeSotho
		SeTswana
		SiPedi
	Shona	Thonga
		ShiTswa
Swahili		KinyaMsezi-Sukuma
		KiKuyu
		ChiNyanja
		IMakua
	LuGanda	LuNyoro
	Achooli-Luo	Nuer
		Dinka
		Nubian
Burmese		Karen
Chinese (Mandarin)	Fukienese	
	Cantonese	
	Shanghai	
	Tibetan	
Japanese		
Thai/Laotian		Shan
Cambodian		Mon
Vietnamese		
Indonesian/Malay	Javanese	Balinese
Malagasy	Sundanese	Menangkabou
		Madurese
Tagalog		Ilocano
		Visayan
Hungarian		
Finnish	Estonian[10]	Karelian
		Zyrien
		Votyak
		Cheremis
		Mordvin

demic world to extend substantial support to programs of linguistic research aimed toward full specification of the grammatical characteristics of the English language. The conference thus recognizes the crucial role of English linguistic research in all language teaching, but emphasizes that this role is, if anything, even more significant in teaching the neglected languages, because there is no large body of empirical experience, such as does exist for the widely taught languages, about the errors that English learners make in learning these languages.

Further, because of the need for comparison between English and the target languages, it is clear that general research into the structural variety of the languages of the world, into the techniques of linguistic comparison and contrast, into bi-lingual interference patterns, into general schema for structural description, all are highly important, and very much in need of support in the course of developing adequate potential for teaching the neglected languages.

Finally, it is clear that accomplishments of any magnitude in these areas of linguistic research depend on the training of larger numbers of competent scholars in general linguistics, which may, in fact, require financial support of graduate students whose dissertations might well be, for instance, structural descriptions of American Indian languages. That is, such studies may quite properly serve as training experiences for developing the scholarly potential we must have to deal effectively with the neglected languages, and should be supported in that light.

Recommendation No. 6. Coordinating the preparation and dissemination of materials: The conference recommends that the Modern Language Association and the U. S. Office of Education express continued concern for creating and disseminating language and area orientation materials designed for the use of U. S. nationals going abroad for any purpose; provide for a series of brief handbooks giving vocabulary of maximum utility, basic grammatical rules, and salient items concerning the culture and geography of each area in which there is significant American activity, and consider the feasibility of establishing a coordinating body to give strength and unity to the preparation of materials and programs for short-term language and area orientation for overseas service.

Recommendation No. 7. Widening the linguistic base of teachers: The conference recommends that in the training of all foreign language teachers, the teaching of English and of the first foreign language be integrated as the initial step in the continued linguistic sophistication of the student, with linguistic training of an appropriate type included at each level. It further recommends the exposure of all potential foreign language teachers to a non-Indo-European language. This will greatly facilitate the acquisition of later languages, including those with which this conference is concerned.

It further recommends that the teaching of non-neglected languages, including English, in the secondary schools be used as a vehicle for the instillation of linguistic principles so that the students will be better prepared for the study of other languages in more advanced levels of their education.

Recommendation No. 8. The function of graduate schools: It is recognized that the great burden of training in neglected languages must fall upon the graduate schools, specialized institutions such as the service schools, and/or specially organized intensive programs. The traditional role of the major Western European languages in general education programs is also recognized by the conference. However, it is believed that collegiate and pre-collegiate programs in the neglected languages might serve the national interest well if developed under conditions which give assurance of continuity and of enduring community and institutional support, and that in the case of a few highly strategic neglected languages it is desirable to provide incentives for their study at the undergraduate level, geared, wherever possible, to the use of these neglected languages in upper-class courses not only in literature and the humanities but in the social and technical sciences.

The conference further invites attention to the important work in language training that is being done in the extra-curricular instructional programs of certain ethnic, religious, and other groups.

Recommendation No. 9. Language entrance and degree requirements: The conference encourages universities to re-examine their entrance and degree requirements with a view to recognizing skills in "neglected" languages at parity with skills in French, Spanish, German, Italian, or Russian, where such skills are compatible with the career objectives of the students concerned. The intent of this recommendation is not to depreciate the role of the commonly taught languages in general education programs, but rather to face up to the fact that skill in those languages alone will not permit us to meet our global communications needs. Some curricula requiring two-language skills might well be improved by a requirement of one of the commonly taught languages and one "neglected" language in lieu of two commonly taught languages.

Recommendation No. 10. Establishment of chairs: The conference recognizes the problems involved by university administrators in establishing permanent chairs and expanding curricula in neglected languages. The national interest requires, however, that programs in neglected languages be established on an enduring basis, which it is impossible to do via government financing alone.

Certain foundations have established endowed chairs, particularly in area studies, some of which include neglected languages. The members of the conference wish to compliment the Foundations for thus assuring institutional permanency for neglected languages programs and to urge them to consider the establishment of more endowed chairs for neglected languages, and to support the expansion of programs for the neglected languages so that permanency and long-term development may be assured.

Recommendation No. 11. Institute patterns: The conference recognizes the unique and invaluable role of the Yale University Institute of Far Eastern Languages in providing intensive practical study of Chinese, Japanese, and Korean for both academic and government personnel, and is aware of the need for similar programs for other neglected languages. It therefore recommends that the Yale program be subjected to study with a view to establishing similar programs for other languages and in other institutions; and that patronage of such programs be encouraged via the provision of fellowships for students at both graduate and undergraduate levels.

Recommendation No. 12. Language and area centers abroad: The conference recommends that the Government and/or foundations, as a principal device in the development of neglected languages, cooperate with the universities by contractual arrangements to establish and maintain *Language and Area Centers Abroad*[12] which would have some, or all, of the following characteristics, modified as appropriate to meet local circumstances:

(1) The Centers would participate in assisting local authorities in the improvement of English instruction. This might include sending local students to train at the U.S. host institution, conduct-

[12] A Center of this type is described in the Stockwell-Prator workpaper. Others are in existence, or are contemplated. Areas that might well be ready for such Centers are: former French Africa, Brazil, former British West Africa, former British East Africa, Korea, Burma, Ceylon, India, Pakistan, Indonesia, Thailand, North Africa and the Near East, Turkey, Yugoslavia, Poland, and Finland. Many current Language and Area Center programs under NDEA support might well be equipped to undertake such activity as a natural extension of their present activities.

ing country workshops in methods and materials for English instruction, and assisting in the preparation of teaching materials.

(2) The Centers would engage in research on local languages, including the preparation of grammars, teaching materials, and dictionaries, utilizing both local and visiting American staff.

(3) The Centers would engage, as needed, in elementary or advanced language training for American persons resident in the country, and would supply instructors for similar training at the host institution.

(4) The Centers would cooperate with local universities in developing adequate programs for the training of professional language scholars. This might well involve exchange of staff with the host institution and actual teaching in the program by members of the Center staff.

(5) The Centers would provide a base for scholars and other persons engaged in research and study in the area for workshops, conferences, and the like between Americans and interested persons from the area.

(6) The Centers would provide a source of information and focus of research concerning local institutions, culture, economics, history, and other aspects of life basic to our mutual appreciation and understanding.

(7) Full cooperation of the host country is to be sought in the planning, establishment, and support of such Centers.

Recommendation No. 13. A resolution: Resolved: That in the following areas the conference recognizes a need for further deliberations if the nation is to meet its communications needs more adequately: the variety and types of programs to meet specific needs; career incentives and institutional incentives, a basic factor in both of which is permanency of programs; professional organization and the enhancement of professional awareness; coordination of plans and programs at the highest echelons of responsibility. It is further resolved that serious study be given to the interlinking and complementary roles of the government, foundations, universities, and such other institutions as are now, or may become, devoted to language development.

INVENTORY OF LANGUAGE LEARNING TOOLS

Language _____ Name of Reporter _____ Date _____

	A suitable & available	B being prepared	C needed and not available	D other
A. Instructional materials				
1 Basic course, normal curriculum				
2 Second year college course				
3 Basic intensive course				
4 Readers, elementary				
5 Readers, intermediate				
6 Readers, advanced				
7 Readers, special subject fields				
8 Other intermediate texts				
9 Other advanced texts				
10 Recorded teaching materials				
11 Other course materials				
12 Tests and other instruments for the certification of competence				
B. Reference and close-support materials				
1 Structural analysis of comprehensive grammar				
2 Learner's reference grammar				
3 Annotated bibliographical guide to studies of the language & area				
4 Introduction to writing systems				
5 Library resources				
6 Dictionary, comprehensive, target language/English				
7 Dictionary, comprehensive, English/target language				
8 Dictionary, student, target language/English				
9 Dictionary, student, English/target language				
10 Other lexical resources				
11 Other language learning tools				